

Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0795/26 **Recommendation:** – REFUSE

Site: 24 Lime Tree Avenue Worthing West Sussex BN14 0DL

Proposal: Wraparound dormer to side and rear roofslopes

Date of Site Visit: 13/08/2026

Neighbours Checked: Y

Additional Neighbours Notified: N

Site and Surroundings

The application site lies within the eastern side of Findon Valley. The property is a detached bungalow which has become a chalet style property under a 2021 permission. There is a dormer to the front elevation and two on the rear elevation. The application site is not listed nor is it located within a conservation area. There are no TPOs on the site.

Proposal

The proposal relates to the introduction of a wraparound dormer on the rear and side roofslopes. The dormer would be flat roofed and positioned on the northeastern corner of the site. The bulk of the massing would be located to the rear of the site with a thinner aspect on the side of the site.

Relevant Planning History:

01/00171/FULL - Alterations and extensions to roof including three dormer roof extensions to provide three bedrooms and two bathrooms

STATUS: Conditional Consent 2nd April 2001.

90/05339/FULL - PROPOSED SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION TO PROVIDE KITCHEN, UTILITY, BATHROOM AND DINING ROOM

STATUS: Conditional Consent 8th November 1990.

Consultations

None

Neighbour Representations

None

Relevant Planning Policies:

Worthing Local Plan policies (WBC 2023): SP1, DM5

National Planning Policy Framework (MHCLG 2026)

National Planning Practice Guidance

SPG 'Extending or Altering Your Home' (WBC)

Planning Assessment:

There is no objection in principle to extensions and alterations to residential dwellings within the built-up area. The key considerations are the effects on the visual and residential amenities of the locality.

Visual Amenity

Policy DM5 i - iii of the Worthing Local Plan requires that:

All new development (including extensions, residential annexes, alterations, ancillary development, change of use and intensification) should:

i) be of a high architectural and design quality and respect and enhance the character of the site and the prevailing character of the area. This will include consideration of proportion, form, design, context, massing, siting, layout, density, height, size, scale, materials, detailed design features and landscaping;

ii) enhance the local environment by way of its appearance and character, with particular attention being paid to the architectural form, height, materials, density, scale, orientation, landscaping, tree canopy, impact on street scene and layout of the development;

iii) make a positive contribution to the sense of place, local character and distinctiveness of an area;

The Council's SPG 'Extending or Altering Your Home' provides general advice on extensions and sets out a number of design principles. It states that:

When designing an extension and deciding on an appropriate siting, the two most important things to ensure are; that the design of your extension achieves an appropriate relationship with the design of the existing house and; that it also takes into account any impact on the street scene. It goes on to say that: The size and shape of any extension should normally be designed to ensure the original house remains the larger and more dominant feature.

In relation to roof extensions and dormers it states that:

Roof extensions and dormers are often highly visible and alien features which greatly alter the appearance of a dwelling. Therefore, there is a normal presumption against dormer windows that are visible from the street. However, exceptions to this can be made if the dormer is located at the rear of the property to make it less visible, or if several other dwellings on the street already have dormer windows, which are not substantially out of character.

Dormers should never be allowed to dominate the roof by being overly large or higher than the existing roof ridge. Where possible they should be designed to follow the vertical lines of existing windows. Always, avoid wrapping dormers around more than one face of the roof, or cutting into the line of the hip.

Hipped roof or gable ended dormers are often preferable to those with flat roofs, because they reduce the overall "bulk" of the extension. This also avoids the horizontal emphasis that is produced by large flat roofed dormers. In some cases a roof light may form a more suitable alternative to a dormer. Whilst the windows themselves should match those of the existing building, the roofs and sides of new dormers should be covered in materials which match or compliment the main roof.

The bungalow has already been extended with dormers to the front and rear of the site which allow additional room in the loft and are modest, well-proportioned additions to the roof.

The proposal is to provide a dormer extension to the northern side roofslope which would connect to the eastern side of the existing dormer creating a wraparound dormer. It would be shallower on the northern side elevation and deeper on the rear extension. The dormer would have a flat roof and be level with the existing roof.

As set out in the SPG, roof extensions and dormers are often highly visible and alien features which greatly alter the appearance of a dwelling. The guidance goes on to state that developments should always avoid wrapping around more than one face of the roof. Due to its nature, being a flat roofed dormer level with the existing roof and of different depths, it would be unsympathetic in form and design, appearing excessive in its size and jarring with the appearance of the roof slope of the recipient building. Although it would be set back on the rear corner of the property the dormer would be apparent in views from the street where its wraparound nature, design and scale would be conspicuous.

Materials to match the existing property do not overcome the harm to visual amenity that has been identified.

Contrary to policy DM5 and the SPG, the extension does not achieve an appropriate relationship with the design of the existing house. It would result in a bulky and incongruous form of development which would appear as a harmful addition to the building and is recommended for refusal on this basis.

Residential Amenity

The main impact as a result of the proposals would be to the occupiers of No. 26 to the north. Neighbouring dwellings to the front, south and rear would be sufficiently separated to avoid any significant impact.

No.26 to the north is a chalet-style bungalow and has a garage on its southern side, adjacent to the boundary with the site, and has been extended to the rear. Despite its size, the bulk of the proposed roof extension on the northern roofslope would be reasonably separated from No.26 given the relationship on this side and would avoid any significant impact in terms of loss of light or outlook. The omission of the windows within the northern elevation ensures that there is not an unacceptable level of overlooking achieved from the proposed development.

The window in the rear of the proposed dormer would be located in the position of the existing smaller rear dormer.

Flooding

The site is identified as being at future risk of surface water flooding. However no new footprint is proposed and therefore floor levels would remain as existing.

Recommendation:

REFUSE for the reason:-

- 1- The proposed wraparound dormer, by reason of its design, positioning and scale, would represent a dominant and unsympathetic form of development, detrimental to the visual amenities of the existing building and streetscene. As such the proposed development would be contrary to policy DM5 of the Worthing Local Plan, the SPG 'Extending or Altering Your Home' and the relevant paragraphs of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Informative

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation? N

Case Officer: Finlay Gardner Date: 04/09/2026

Authorised by: Louise Prew Date: 04/09/2026